REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-7 and 13-18 have been amended. Claims 1, 13, 17, and 18 are independent claims. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the outstanding rejections in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0193703 to Loewy et al. (hereafter "Loewy"). This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-18, as amended, are not anticipated by Lowey. MPEP § 2131 sets forth the following:

> "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros V Union Oil Co. Of California*, 814 F2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claims." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co*, 868 F2d 1226, 1236, 9 USQP2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

It is respectfully submitted that Loewy does not set forth each and every element as defined in the claims. Thus, the Examiner's rejection based on § 102 has been obviated.

Claims 1, 13, and 18

In particular, as amended, independent claims 1, 13, and 18 recite identifying, or receiving data that includes, device-specific constraints imposed by the hosting environment settings on prospective applications to be hosted on the hosting environment.

In the rejection, the Examiner relies on Loewy's policies for the claimed constraints (see Office Action at pg. 3, first paragraph) However, Applicants respectfully submit that Loewy's policies do not impose device-specific constraints as claimed.

Loewy's invention is designed for configuring the policies in a <u>Service Oriented Architecture</u> (SOA) and ensuring conformance with such policies. In order to help explain Loewy's SOA policies, reference will be made to the Wikipedia article on Service Oriented Architecture, which is attached as Exhibit A. As described in this article, an SOA is a software architecture that defines the use of loosely coupled software services (see Exh. A at pg. 1, first paragraph). The policies define rules to be followed by the interface documents (i.e., messages calling the software services) to follow (see Loewy at paragraph 0049).

The SOA described in Loewy is <u>not</u> device-specific. An SOA is <u>not</u> tied to a specific technology; the network resources in an SOA are made available as software services that can be accessed without knowledge of their underlying platform implementation (see Exh. A, at pg. 1, first two paragraphs). As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Loewy's policies do <u>not</u> impose device-specific constraints on the interface documents, or on any application in the SOA. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no specific teaching or suggestion in Loewy that these policies impose a device-specific constraint.

At least for the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that Loewy fails to teach or suggest every element recited in independent claims 1, 13, and 18. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 13, and 18 are allowable, and claims 2-12, 14, and 15 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on allowable independent claims. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Claim 17

As amended, claim 17 recites displaying an element representing <u>a device</u> in the hosting environment in a region of the user interface screen. In the rejection, the Examiner relies on Fig. 22 of Loewy to teach the claimed user interface screen (see Office Action at pg. 4, last paragraph

– pg. 5, first paragraph). However, Loewy teaches that the user interface in Figs. 20-26 are screenshots of the software allowing the user to define policies, assign the policies to a project, upload interface documents for testing, and test the interface documents for compliance with the policies (see Loewy at paragraphs 0217-0224). There is no teaching or suggestion in Loewy that any of the elements in these screenshots represents a device in the hosting environment.

In fact, as described above in connection with claims 1, 13, and 18, an SOA is not tied to specific technology and, thus, Loewy's policies do not impose device-specific constraints. Since it is not necessary for Loewy's software to test compliance with device-specific constraints, there is no need for devices to be represented on Loewy's user interface.

Thus, Loewy providers no teaching or suggestion of displaying an element representing a device on the user interface, as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 17 is allowable over Loewy. In view of this, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Conclusion

Entry of this Amendment After Final is respectfully requested. In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the outstanding rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance in the present application.

Should the Examiner believe that any outstanding matters remain in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Jason W. Rhodes (Reg. No. 47,305) at the telephone number of the undersigned to discuss the present application in an effort to expedite prosecution.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: April 16, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By _____ #47,305

for   Michael K. Mutter
Registration No.: 29,680
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant